Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 13, 15 – 23 and 25 - 34 are presently pending in the application. Claims 4, 14 and 24 were previously canceled. Claims 33 – 34 are new. As it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their previously presented form, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

On page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 – 2, 5 – 12, 15 – 22 and 25 - 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,997 to Scott ("**SCOTT**") in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0018458 to Aiello et al ("**AIELLO**"). On page 13 of the Office Action, claims 3, 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **SCOTT** in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,928,065 to Logalbo et al ("**LOGALBO**"), and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141478 to Ozluturk ("**OZLUTURK**").

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 31 recite, among other limitations:

> a transmitter of said base station being configured to transmit first data bursts to said mobile stations, at least some of the first data bursts containing at least two data blocks intended for different ones of said mobile stations, **said transmitter being configured to produce identification information for said piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of each of the first data bursts;**
> [emphasis added by Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 11 requires, among other limitations:

> **first data bursts** transmitted from the base station to the mobile stations, with at least some of said first data burst containing at least two data blocks, each of said data blocks being intended for different mobile stations, and further **containing identification information for the piconetwork only at a start of each of said first data bursts;** [emphasis added by Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 21 recites, among other limitations:

> (a) **transmitting a first data burst** from the base station to the mobile stations, the first data burst containing at least two data blocks each intended for a different one of the mobile stations, **including transmitting identification information for the piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of the first data burst;** [emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, all of Applicants' claims require, among other limitations, **transmission of a first data burst including identification information for the piconetwork only at the start of the transmission of the first data burst.**

Page 4 of the Office Action acknowledges that the **SCOTT** reference fails to teach or suggest the above-limitations of Applicants' claims, stating, in part:

> However, Scott does not specifically disclose identification information of said piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of each of the first data bursts ….

Rather, page 4 of the Office Action goes on to point to the **AIELLO** reference as allegedly disclosing:

> … identification information (fig. 4(base), paragraph 0073 (master sync)) for said piconetwork (paragraph 0015 (Bluetooth)) only at a start of a transmission of each of the first data bursts (fig. 4 (base), paragraph 0073 (master sync)), ….

Applicants respectfully disagree.

More particularly, the "master sync" word of **AIELLO**, pointed to in the Office Action, is **not**, and does **not** teach or suggest, Applicants' particularly claimed "identification information for the piconetwork". Paragraph [0073], cited in the Office Action, states, in part:

> In the preferred embodiment, the TDMA frame definition 58 comprises a master slot 60, a command slot 62, and a plurality of data slots 64a through 64n. **The master slot 60 contains a synchronizing beacon or "master sync". More preferably, the "master sync" is the same code as the "master sync code" as described earlier for clock synchronization unit 40.** [emphasis added by Applicants]

However, this "master sync" beacon of paragraph [0073] of **AIELLO** is merely **a "Start-Of-Frame" symbol (SOF) that is used to delineate a new frame**, as described in paragraph [0074] of **AIELLO**, which states, in part:

> As noted above, the transceiver device 22 includes a framing control function 38. The framing control function 38 carries out the operation of generating and maintaining the time frame information. In the master device 12 the framing control function 38 delineates each new frame by Start-Of-Frame (SOF) symbols. **The SOF symbols are unique symbols, which do not appear anywhere else within the frame and mark the start of each frame. In the preferred embodiment, the SOF symbols serve as the "master sync" and as the "master sync code" for the network and are transmitted in the master slot 60 of frame 58.** These SOF symbols are used by the framing control function 38 in each of the slave devices 14a through 14n on the network to ascertain the beginning of each frame 58 from the incoming data stream. For example, in one illustrative embodiment, the invention utilizes a 10-bit SOF "master sync" code of "0111111110". [emphasis added by Applicants]

As can be seen from the foregoing portion of **AIELLO**, paragraph [0074] of **AIELLO** teaches that the master sync of **AIELLO** is an SOF symbol that is a unique symbol not appearing anywhere else within the frame, and which is used to mark the start of each frame. In one illustrative embodiment, the **AIELLO** utilizes a 10-bit SOF "master sync" code of "0111111110". In **AIELLO**, a common data encoding scheme may be used to guarantee that the master sync word (SOF) will not appear anywhere else in the data sequence of the frame. This master sync word of **AIELLO**

is **not** analogous to Applicants' particularly claimed "identification information for the piconetwork.

In particular, Applicants' claims specifically require the identification information of the claimed invention be "identification information for the piconetwork", i.e., providing information for the piconetwork. One particular example of such "identification information for the network" is, for example, a channel access code (CAC) according to the Bluetooth Standard. See, for example, page 16 of the instant application, lines 18 - 21 and new claim 33. The receiver of a time frame may be interested to learn about the sender from which a frame originates, or about the transmission channel transporting the frame. In contrast to Applicants' invention, by using "a unique identification information (master sync)", as in **AIELLO**, only a single channel access code can be identified. A unique identifier (master sync) is **cannot** identify a plurality of channel access codes. Thus, the "master sync" of **AIELLO**, formed by a "unique symbol" is **not**, and **cannot** be used as, Applicants' particularly claimed identification information for the piconetwork as claimed in claims 1, 11, 21 and 31.

Thus, neither **AIELLO**, nor **SCOTT**, teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicants' claims, **transmission of a first**

data burst including identification information for the piconetwork only at the start of the transmission of the first data burst. Thus, Applicants' claims are patentable over the **AIELLO** and **SCOTT** references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Further, Applicants' independent claim 1 additionally recites, among other limitations:

> each of said mobile stations having a transmitter configured to transmit a group of second data bursts containing a data block intended for said base station, **said transmitter being configured to produce identification information for said piconetwork at a start of a transmission of the second data bursts;**

Applicants' claims 11, 21 and 31 recite similar limitations, among others. As such, each of Applicants' independent claims requires, among other limitations, **a transmitter at the mobile stations configured to produce identification information for the piconetwork at a start of a transmission of the second data bursts.** The Office Action only points to **AIELLO** as allegedly disclosing **identification information for the piconetwork in the first data bursts.** However, the Office Action does not point to **any** feature of **SCOTT** or **AIELLO** as allegedly disclosing **identification information for the piconetwork at a start of a transmission of the second data bursts**, as required by Applicants' claims. This limitation or Applicants' claims appears to have been wholly ignored in the

Office Action. Applicants' believe that the references do not, in fact, show this limitation of Applicants' claims.

For example, paragraph [0074] of the **AIELLO** reference discloses that the master sync symbol of **AIELLO** is a "unique symbol" that appears **only once in each frame**. Under these conditions, if the master sync of **AIELLO** were to be analogized to Applicants' claimed "identification information", arguendo, transmitting this "unique symbol" in the second data bursts **would not be permitted** in **AIELLO**. As such, in view of this teaching in **AIELLO**, a person of ordinary skill in this art would **not** apply the master sync symbol (i.e., analogized, arguendo, to Applicants' "identification information for the piconetwork") of **AIELLO** to the second data bursts, as would be required by Applicants' claims. **AIELLO** specifically teaches against providing this symbol more than once per frame.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, Applicants' claims are believed to be patentable over the **AIELLO** and **SCOTT** references, taken alone or in combination. The **LOGALBO** and **OZLUTURK** references, cited on page 13 of the Office Action in combination with **SCOTT** against claims 3, 13 and 23, do not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the **SCOTT** and **AIELLO** references.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, 21, and 31. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 11 or 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 3, 5 - 13, 15 - 23 and 25 - 34 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kerry Pauline Sisselman/
Kerry Pauline Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237

For Applicants

September 9, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101